

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 THE HONORABLE MARSHA J. PECHMAN
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

HUONG HOANG, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC. a Delaware corporation, and IMDB.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

No. 2:11-CV-01709-MJP

DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM TRIAL DEADLINES AND TO CONTINUE TRIAL DATE

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff's Motion for Relief from Trial Deadlines and to Continue Trial Date ("Motion"), Dkt. No. 50, should be denied because Plaintiff is responsible for any purported difficulty she may have in meeting the discovery and trial deadlines set by this Court in its February 6, 2012 scheduling order. Dkt. No. 38. Plaintiff waited over five months before serving any discovery, despite the fact that the Court set this action on a relatively quick trial schedule. Plaintiff also has failed to respond to Defendants' efforts to negotiate a mutually acceptable protective order. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion does not come close to demonstrating the diligence necessary to show "good cause" for extending the discovery and trial dates.

DEFS.' OPP. TO PL.'S MOT. FOR RELIEF
FROM TRIAL DEADLINES (No.2:11-CV-01709-
MJP) – 1

24976-0480/LEGAL23839520.5

Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Phone: 206.359.8000
Fax: 206.359.9000

II. BACKGROUND

A. Plaintiff Delayed Propounding and Responding to Discovery

Plaintiff seeks an extension of deadlines due to purported delays in discovery, but she is responsible for any such delays. Plaintiff waited until March 27, 2012 to issue interrogatories and requests for production to Defendants—over five months after filing her original complaint and nearly three months after the parties’ Rule 26(f) conference on January 12, 2012.

Declaration of Ashley Locke (“Locke Decl.”), Exs. A-D; *see also* Dkt. No. 36. The Court’s scheduling order issued on February 6, 2012 allowed just seven months for discovery, yet Plaintiff took no action to develop her case for over a month and a half.

Nor has Plaintiff been diligent in negotiating a mutually desirable protective order. Before she served any discovery, on January 27, 2012, Plaintiff provided Defendants with a proposed draft protective order. Locke Decl., Exs. E, F. However, that protective order failed to incorporate this District's rules regarding filing under seal and otherwise failed to comply with local rules. Thus, Defendants sent Plaintiff a new draft that complied with the local rules and a sample order previously entered by this Court. *Id.*, Exs. G-I. To date, the parties have still not yet resolved their differences over the protective order.

On April 30, 2012, Defendants provided responses and answers to Plaintiff's discovery requests, producing over 1,040 pages of documents and responding in substance to Plaintiff's interrogatories, even though the parties had yet to finalize a protective order. *Id.* ¶ 12, Exs. J-M. Defendants also committed to supplement their production with confidential information and documents after entry of a protective order. *Id.*

By contrast, in her May 7, 2012 objections and responses to Defendant's discovery requests, Plaintiff refused to provide a single document, objecting on the grounds that they sought confidential information. *Id.*, Ex. N. While Plaintiff has agreed to produce substantive responses to Defendants' discovery requests after entry of a protective order, she has not explained her failure to produce clearly public information, such as copies of and information

DEFS.' OPP. TO PL.'S MOT. FOR RELIEF
FROM TRIAL DEADLINES (No.2:11-CV-01709-
MJP) - 2

24976-0480/LEGAL23839520.5

Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Phone: 206.359.8000
Fax: 206.359.9000

1 regarding her website, her public profile on IMDb.com, and any of her government issued
 2 identification. *Id.*

3
 4 On May 24, 2012, the parties held a Rule 37 conference regarding their mutual discovery
 5 responses and the protective order. The parties agreed that many of Plaintiff's objections to
 6 Defendants' discovery responses would be resolved upon entry of a protective order, at which
 7 time Defendants would supplement their discovery responses with additional documents and
 8 information. Following the conference, Amazon.com even agreed to respond to discovery
 9 requests relating to new allegations in her Second Amended Complaint ("SAC")—which was
 10 filed just three business days prior to Defendants' deadline to respond to Plaintiff's discovery
 11 requests. Locke Decl., Exs. O-Q. But, Plaintiff *again* failed to provide proposed revisions to the
 12 draft order, as promised during that conference, for another two weeks. *Id.*, Exs. O-Q; *see also*
 13 Motion at 2-3 (describing Rule 37 meet-and-confer conference).

14 Pursuant to the current scheduling order, expert disclosures were due on June 11, 2012.
 15 Despite having the burden to prove her claims in this case, Plaintiff did not disclose any experts
 16 at that time. Locke Decl. ¶ 22.

17 **B. Plaintiff Has Previously Tried to Delay this Litigation**

18 This Motion is not Plaintiff's first attempt to delay this litigation. In the parties' initial
 19 Joint Status Report and Discovery Plan, Plaintiff requested a drawn out case schedule, seeking a
 20 full year of discovery. Dkt. No. 36. Defendants sought a more efficient timeline, with a
 21 discovery period of six months. *Id.* at 4. On February 6, 2012, this Court set the current
 22 schedule, which provided seven months from the date of the order to complete discovery. Dkt.
 23 No. 38 (adjusting the previous court schedule, Dkt. No. 19). On March 9, 2012, Plaintiff *again*
 24 requested an extended schedule, by letter to the Court asking it to "rule on the Defendants'"
 25 Motion to Dismiss [Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6)], or in the alternative, [to] consider extending the
 26 dates and deadlines set forth in its February 6, 2012 Order Setting Trial Date & Related Dates."
 27 Dkt. No. 39. Plaintiff's letter, much like the pending Motion, does not demonstrate Plaintiff
 28

29 DEFS.' OPP. TO PL.'S MOT. FOR RELIEF
 30 FROM TRIAL DEADLINES (No.2:11-CV-01709-
 31 MJP) – 3

32 24976-0480/LEGAL23839520.5

33 **Perkins Coie LLP**
 34 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
 35 Seattle, WA 98101-3099
 36 Phone: 206.359.8000
 37 Fax: 206.359.9000

diligently attempting to comply with the existing schedule. This Court declined to extend the schedule at that time.

After the Court granted in part and denied in part Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to 12(b)(6), Dkt. No. 42, Plaintiff again delayed. Plaintiff sought additional time to file an amended complaint and ultimately did not file her SAC until April 25, 2012—nearly *four weeks* after this Court's Order allowing her to amend. *See* Locke Decl., Ex. R; *see also* Dkt. No. 43. When Plaintiff filed her SAC, it included *entirely new* allegations with respect to Amazon.com. Plaintiff did not explain why she could not have included these new allegations in her initial complaint. Indeed, the new allegations were wholly within her own knowledge; for example, she added allegations that she purchased items on Amazon.com and that Amazon.com violated its own privacy policies with respect to those purchases. Dkt. No. 45, ¶¶ 46-49. On May 9, 2012, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's fraud claim, which included these new allegations. Dkt. No. 46.

III. ARGUMENT

A. Modifying a Court Scheduling Order Requires “Good Cause” and “Diligence”

A case schedule “may be modified *only* for good cause and with the judge’s consent.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 16(b)(4) (emphasis added). It is the moving party’s burden to establish “good cause” under Rule 16(b). *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 608-09 (9th Cir. 1992) (stating the moving party “needed to show good cause” under Rule 16(b)); *B2B CFO Partners, LLC v. Kaufman*, No. 09-2158, 2011 WL 2713887 (D. Ariz. July 13, 2011) (citing *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 608-09) (listing what “the movant should show” in order “to meet its burden under Rule 16(b)’s ‘good cause’ standard”); *U.S. E.E.O.C. v. Ian Schrager Hotels, Inc.*, No. 99-0987, 2000 WL 307470 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 8, 2000) (citing *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 608-09) (“The party seeking to amend the scheduling order has the burden of establishing good cause.”). The good cause requirement confirms that “[a] scheduling order is not a frivolous piece of paper, idly entered, which can be cavalierly disregarded by counsel without peril.” *Johnson*, 975 F.2d

DEFS.' OPP. TO PL.'S MOT. FOR RELIEF
FROM TRIAL DEADLINES (No.2:11-CV-01709-
MJP) - 4

24976-0480/LEGAL23839520.5

Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Phone: 206.359.8000
Fax: 206.359.9000

1 at 610 (internal quotation marks omitted) (citing *Gestetner Corp. v. Case Equip. Corp.*, 108
 2 F.R.D. 138, 141 (D. Me. 1985)).
 3

4 As part of the “good cause” showing, the party seeking a continuance must demonstrate
 5 diligence in pursuing the litigation; if the moving party was not diligent, “the inquiry should
 6 end.” *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 609; see *Noyes v. Kelly Servs.*, 488 F.3d 1163, 1174 n.6 (9th Cir.
 7 2007) (citing *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 609) (“Rule 16(b) provides that a district court’s scheduling
 8 order may be modified upon a showing of ‘good cause,’ an inquiry which focuses on the
 9 reasonable diligence of the moving party.”); *Coleman v. Quaker Oats Co.*, 232 F.3d 1271, 1294-
 10 95 (9th Cir. 2000) (upholding district court’s refusal to permit party to amend after the deadline
 11 because the moving parties “failed to show diligence”). The “good cause” standard, which
 12 requires a showing of diligence by the moving party, also applies to motions to extend deadlines
 13 for discovery and expert reports in addition to motions to extend trial schedules. *Bush v. Pioneer*
 14 *Human Servs.*, No. C09-0518-RSM, 2010 WL 324432, at *3 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 21, 2010)
 15 (denying motion to extend deadlines because the moving party “did not act diligently in
 16 attempting to meet the expert disclosure deadline”); *Nelson v. Fed. Way Dep’t of Pub. Safety*,
 17 No. C06-1142-RSL, 2007 WL 1655214, at *1 (W.D. Wash. June 5, 2007) (denying extension of
 18 expert report deadline by 60 days because “[w]hile plaintiff might have been diligent in
 19 attempting to obtain a stipulation, plaintiff has not shown *diligence* in attempting to meet the
 20 scheduling order’s deadlines” (emphasis in original)); *Chen v. Dougherty*, No. C04-987-MJP,
 21 2007 WL 1461205, at *2 (W.D. Wash. May 16, 2007) (granting in part and denying in part
 22 motion for new case schedule and trial date; setting new trial date because party was entitled to
 23 file a renewed summary judgment in light of new case law, but finding there was no “good cause
 24 to set new discovery or expert report deadlines” where those deadlines had already passed).
 25

26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51

DEFS.’ OPP. TO PL.’S MOT. FOR RELIEF
 FROM TRIAL DEADLINES (No.2:11-CV-01709-
 MJP) – 5

24976-0480/LEGAL23839520.5

Perkins Coie LLP
 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
 Seattle, WA 98101-3099
 Phone: 206.359.8000
 Fax: 206.359.9000

1 **B. Plaintiff Has Not Acted with Diligence**

2 Plaintiff fails to demonstrate the good cause or diligence to justify any extension of the
 3 trial and related deadlines in this case. In fact, Plaintiff's complaints about timing hinge on
 4 factors entirely within her control. Thus, the Court should deny Plaintiff's Motion.
 5
 6

7 **1. Plaintiff has not exercised diligence in discovery.**

8 Plaintiff argues that there is "good cause" to extend the schedule because the parties are
 9 engaged in discovery disputes, because the parties have not yet agreed to a protective order and
 10 because the July 11, 2012 discovery motion deadline leaves little time for her to obtain
 11 discovery. Motion at 4-5. These reasons do not constitute "good cause" because Plaintiff has
 12 not exercised diligence in seeking discovery. Plaintiff chose not to serve discovery until *over*
 13 *five months* after filing her original complaint. As the master of her lawsuit, Plaintiff could have
 14 issued discovery requests any time after the parties' Rule 26(f) conference, which occurred on
 15 January 12, 2012. Dkt. No. 36; *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d), 26(f). While waiting almost three
 16 months from the Rule 26(f) conference to issue discovery and five months from filing the
 17 original Complaint is her prerogative, Plaintiff cannot reasonably seek an extension as a result of
 18 such a delay. Serving discovery "in an untimely manner do[es] not constitute good cause for
 19 modifying the scheduling order." *Carter v. City of Carlsbad*, No. 10-CV-1072, 2011 WL
 20 1236574, *1 (S.D. Cal. April 1, 2011) (denying plaintiff's motion to extend discovery); *see also*
 21 *Darrah v. Virgin Islands*, No. 2009-068, 2011 WL 6181352, at *5 (D. Virgin Islands Dec. 13,
 22 2011) (The "proffered reasons for failing to conduct discovery during the initial six-month
 23 period does not excuse the parties' lack of diligence nor constitute 'good cause' for an extension
 24 of the deadlines").
 25

26 Plaintiff cannot rely on a discovery dispute to justify an extension of trial deadlines.
 27 Unsatisfactory discovery responses from a party do not warrant relief from a scheduling order.
 28 *See Pulliam v. Lozano*, No. 1:07-CV-00964-LJO-MJS-PC, 2012 WL 259937, at *2 (E.D. Cal.
 29 Jan. 27, 2012) ("Plaintiff asks that the discovery deadline be extended due to the 'insufficient
 30 DEFs.' OPP. TO PL.'S MOT. FOR RELIEF
 31 FROM TRIAL DEADLINES (No.2:11-CV-01709-
 32 MJP) – 6
 33 24976-0480/LEGAL23839520.5

discovery responses Defendants have provided Plaintiff thus far.’ . . . Plaintiff has failed to show good cause . . . The Court finds no basis for extending the discovery deadline.”). Moreover, Plaintiff has not established that there *is* a real discovery dispute about Amazon.com’s discovery responses, as Amazon.com has agreed to supplement its discovery responses upon entry of a protective order. While Amazon.com objected to providing discovery relating to Plaintiff’s new allegations in the SAC, after the Rule 37 conference, *Amazon.com agreed to provide such discovery*—a fact conspicuously absent from Plaintiff’s motion. Locke Decl., Ex. O. Indeed, Plaintiff has not demanded any further discovery from Defendants since that conference. *See id.*, ¶ 21. Finally, if Plaintiff believes that Defendants’ discovery responses are deficient after Defendants supplement their discovery upon entry of a protective order, Plaintiff has an adequate remedy through a motion to compel. She does not need an extension of the trial date.

Defendants have made clear they will produce the information Plaintiff is seeking upon entry of a satisfactory protective order. Yet Plaintiff has not been diligent in securing that protective order—and in fact has actively delayed such negotiations. Despite repeated requests for comments and suggestions from Defendants’ counsel, Plaintiff delayed progress by only responding to the draft order after a significant amount of time. *Id.*, Ex. S. This is far from the diligence required under the good cause standard. As Judge Martinez previously explained in denying a defendant’s motion to extend deadlines:

This is not to say that diligence required Defendant to accept Plaintiff’s proposed protective order, but it did not require Defendant to do *something* to move discovery forward. Parties may not ignore scheduling deadlines simply because they are at an impasse, especially when little is being done to resolve it.

Bush, Case No. C09-0518, 2010 WL 324432, at *3 (emphasis in original). The lack of a protective order here is not grounds for an extension of the trial schedule.

2. Plaintiff has not exercised diligence in seeking an extension.

Similarly, Plaintiff has not shown “good cause” for an extension because she has not explained why she waited until June to seek to extend the schedule set by this Court on

DEFS.’ OPP. TO PL.’S MOT. FOR RELIEF
FROM TRIAL DEADLINES (No.2:11-CV-01709-
MJP) – 7

24976-0480/LEGAL23839520.5

Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Phone: 206.359.8000
Fax: 206.359.9000

1 February 6, 2012. Plaintiff waited four months to file this Motion, and only eleven days before
 2 the deadline for her to disclose experts. Plaintiff can hardly claim that she did not anticipate
 3 requiring additional time; indeed, she informally (and improperly) sought more time via letter to
 4 the Court dated March 9, 2012. When that tactic did not work, she waited *an additional three*
 5 *months* before formally moving to extend the schedule. Such a delay in moving to extend a trial
 6 schedule demonstrates a lack of diligence. *Zivkovic v. S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 302 F.3d 1080, 1087-
 7 88 (9th Cir. 2002) (“[C]ounsel did not seek to modify that court order until four months after the
 9 court issued the order. [The moving party] did not demonstrate diligence in complying with the
 10 dates set by the district court and has not demonstrated ‘good cause’ for modifying the
 11 scheduling order, as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b).”).

20 **3. Plaintiff has not otherwise shown “good cause” for an extension.**

21 Nor does Defendants’ pending motion to dismiss justify an extension of the scheduling
 22 order. As discussed above, Amazon.com has agreed to provide discovery relating Plaintiff’s
 23 fraud claim—the very subject of the pending motion to dismiss. Locke Decl., Ex. P. Moreover,
 24 the fact that no answer is yet required by Defendants does not justify the delay. At a minimum,
 25 Plaintiff need not have waited four months to propound discovery on subjects related to her own
 26 claims (discovery that is not dependent on Defendants’ particularly pled defenses) even though
 27 the lack of an answer is Plaintiff’s primary rationale relied on for the delay. Indeed, Plaintiff’s
 28 pending discovery evidences that she had ample information to propound her requests; she
 29 simply chose to wait months to do so.

30 Further, Plaintiff has not explained why she could not meet the expert disclosure deadline
 31 due to the pending motion or lack of an answer. Plaintiff has the burden of proof in this case, yet
 32 on June 11, she failed to disclose *any* experts relating to her affirmative case, such as experts
 33 regarding her alleged damages. *Id.*, ¶ 22. Plaintiff should not be allowed a second chance to
 34 disclose experts where, as here, she has all the information necessary for expert disclosures.

35 *Reliance Ins. Co. v. La. Land Exploration Co.*, 110 F.3d 253, 257-58 (5th Cir. 1997) (upholding

36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51 DEFS.’ OPP. TO PL.’S MOT. FOR RELIEF
 FROM TRIAL DEADLINES (No.2:11-CV-01709-
 MJP) – 8

52 24976-0480/LEGAL23839520.5

Perkins Coie LLP
 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
 Seattle, WA 98101-3099
 Phone: 206.359.8000
 Fax: 206.359.9000

1 district court's denial of request to extend deadline to supplement expert reports when movant
 2 "offered no justification for its delay" and reasoning that "[d]istrict judges have the power to
 3 control their dockets by refusing to give ineffective litigants a second chance to develop their
 4 case").
 5

6 **C. Extending the Trial Schedule Would Cause Undue Delay and Prejudice**

7 An extension is inappropriate for the additional reason that it would prejudice Defendants
 8 and this Court. Delaying litigation and otherwise drawing out the process necessarily results in
 9 higher attorney fees and costs and congests this Court's calendar. An extension here would be
 10 particularly unjust given Plaintiff's past attempts to delay these proceedings, thereby raising
 11 costs and fees for the parties. Giving Plaintiff additional time to prepare her case theory, experts,
 12 and dispositive motions would essentially punish Defendants, who have worked diligently to
 13 meet this Court's deadlines and have done so with a serially unresponsive Plaintiff. *Bush*, 2010
 14 WL 324432, at *4 (denying request to extend expert disclosure deadline and other trial deadlines
 15 because it would be unfair to allow the moving party additional time to file expert reports when
 16 the nonmoving party filed its expert report "well before the deadline"). Defendants have
 17 expended energy and costs in responding to discovery, drafting motions, and repeatedly
 18 contacting Plaintiff for updates regarding the status of drafts and pleadings. Defendants should
 19 not be left holding the bill for Plaintiff's delays.
 20

21 **IV. CONCLUSION**

22 For the reasons stated above, Defendants respectfully request this Court deny Plaintiff's
 23 Motion for Relief from Trial Deadlines and to Continue Trial Date.
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51

DEFS.' OPP. TO PL.'S MOT. FOR RELIEF
 FROM TRIAL DEADLINES (No.2:11-CV-01709-
 MJP) – 9

24976-0480/LEGAL23839520.5

Perkins Coie LLP
 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
 Seattle, WA 98101-3099
 Phone: 206.359.8000
 Fax: 206.359.9000

1
2 DATED: June 13, 2012
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

By: s/ Ashley Locke
Ashley A. Locke, WSBA No. 40521
Breena M. Roos, WSBA No. 34501
Charles C. Sipos, WSBA No. 32825
Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Telephone: 206.359.8000
Facsimile: 206.359.9000
Email: BRoos@perkinscoie.com
CSipos@perkinscoie.com
ALocke@perkinscoie.com
Attorneys for Defendants Amazon.com and
IMDb.com

DEFS.' OPP. TO PL.'S MOT. FOR RELIEF
FROM TRIAL DEADLINES (No.2:11-CV-01709-
MJP) – 10

24976-0480/LEGAL23839520.5

Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Phone: 206.359.8000
Fax: 206.359.9000

1
2
3
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
4
5
6
7
8
9

10 I certify that on June 13, 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing **DEFENDANTS'**
11
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM TRIAL DEADLINES
12
AND TO CONTINUE TRIAL DATE with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system,
13
which will send notification of such filing to the following attorneys of record

14
John W Dozier , Jr
Dozier Internet Law
301 Concourse Blvd
West Shore III , Ste 300
Glen Allen, VA 23059
15
16
17

18 _____ Via hand delivery
19 _____ Via U.S. Mail, 1st Class, Postage Prepaid
20 _____ Via Overnight Delivery
21 _____ Via Facsimile
22 _____ Via Email
23 **X** _____ Via ECF
24
25
26

27
Randall Moeller
Derek Alan Newman
Newman & Newman
1201 Third Avenue, Ste 1600
Seattle, WA 98
28
29
30

31 _____ Via hand delivery
32 _____ Via U.S. Mail, 1st Class, Postage Prepaid
33 _____ Via Overnight Delivery
34 _____ Via Facsimile
35 _____ Via Email
36 **X** _____ Via ECF _____
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

53 DATED this 13th day of June, 2012.
54
55

56 s/ Ashley Locke
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

101 Ashley Locke, WSBA No. 40521
102 Charles C. Sipos, WSBA No. 32825
103 Breena M. Roos, WSBA No. 34501
104 **Perkins Coie LLP**
105 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
106 Seattle, WA 98101-3099
107 Telephone: 206.359.8000
108 Facsimile: 206.359.9000
109 E-mail: alocke@perkinscoie.com
110 E-mail: csipos@perkinscoie.com
111 E-mail: broos@perkinscoie.com
112 Attorneys for Defendants Amazon.com, Inc.
113 and IMDb.com, Inc.
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
13